Star 3/6/67

New Orleans Investigation

EDITOR: If the editorial writers of your paper had been carefully reading their own paper's accounts of the New Orleans assassination investigation, they never could have produced the malicious non-sequiturs which abound in "Where's the Evidence?"

The Star, of course, could prove to be right in nearly insinuating that the flamboyant lawyer is a publicity-seeking conviction-obsessed D.A. who after an initial reluctance to talk has now spilled too many verbal beans about charges which will prove insignificant. But until such time this possibility does not excuse the general attitude, the premature dismissal of Garrison as just another assassination "theorist," because he does not intend to try his case in the newspapers and risk a Supreme Court comeuppance.

Garrison has more than theories. He has at least one witness to a plot involving Cubans. And he may have evidence he cannot release yet. "The D.A. has managed to keep in the headlines." Baloney! The Star, the New Orleans papers and all the rest managed this while Garrison was trying to keep it hush-hush. If he "protested too much" it was about the publicity. Is the claim that his success in attracting attention—"lies in his own personality" either ethical or really relevant? Wouldn't any D.A. in the U.S. who calmly announced he had evidence of and witnessed to a plot been given comparable attention?

Bruce Gossaboom.

Rockville, Md.